# REPORT TO THE COMMISSIONER OF THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICE OF CANADA ON A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS AND THEIR PARTNERS IN 1981

PUBLISHED BY THE
COMMUNICATIONS BRANCH
CORRECTIONAL SERVICE
OF CANADA
MAY, 1982

Canada

Correctional Service Canada | Service correctionnel Canada

# REPORT TO THE COMMISSIONER OF THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICE OF CANADA ON A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS AND THEIR PARTNERS IN 1981

Published by the
Communications Branch
Correctional Service
of Canada
May, 1982

# REPORT TO THE COMMISSIONER OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES OF CANADA ON A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS AND THEIR PARTNERS IN 1981[1]

by

T.C. Willett
Department of Sociology
Queen's University

## INTRODUCTION

### 1. How the Project Originated

During 1978 the present Commissioner of Corrections, Mr. D. Yeomans, read a report by the writer on a study of correctional staff completed during 1972 (see below) and invited ideas for more research. Among these was a proposal that further interviews be carried out with the 10 men last seen in 1973 who remained in the service, and also with their partners.[2] A plan for this work was submitted and approved to begin in July 1980, after clearance with senior officers of the Union of Solicitor-General Employees (USGE). Funding was by the Solicitor-General under a contract with Queen's University; this provided for the employment of Mr. Allen Wale, now of DND, and his wife, both of whom had worked with the writer in the earlier project. Fieldwork began on 20th June and was completed on 7th September 1980.

### 2. The Initial Project

a. As in the current instance, the first study was initiated by the writer and was funded under contract by the Solicitor-General. It was designed as a pilot project to study what was then a neglected role in prison work: that of the basic grade custodian--the CX 1 or 2. The primary focus was on the men's self-perceptions as they developed in the prison and on the 8 week induction course at the Correctional Staff College (CSC); it was also on

---

1. I am indebted to Ms. Virginia Bartley for a careful evaluative scrutiny of the draft of this Report and for some valuable suggestions to amend its content. I am grateful also to Mr. and Mrs. J.A. Wale for their comments and suggestions.

2. The term partners is used to denote spouses and 'common-law' partners.

their family lives and their social experience in "the world outside". The secondary aim was to examine the "fit" between the course objectives sought by the instructional staff on the one hand, and those received by the men on the other. Additionally, some theoretical propositions about correctional services as agencies of social control were developed and examined (see para 5 below).

b. A theoretical framework was created from the idea of Gerth and Mills (1954) postulating a relationship between social structure and personality that is expressed in the concept of the "key role". It was postulated that key roles in organizations like prisons are found at the synapses or junction points at which policy or intention becomes action: it was suggested that correctional officers occupy such positions in the prison. A theoretical model, or 'ideal type', was worked out for a penal system in which a pre-requisite for effectiveness is integration between the three elements of selection, training, and operations. A further model, or 'ideal type' was developed for a correctional officer in such a system. The models were used as guidelines for methodology and for analysing the data.

c. The subjects were a complete intake of 20 anglophone males trained at the CSC between April and June 1973 and posted subsequently to five prisons in eastern Ontario. As three left the region after the course, the complete work was done with 17 men who were interviewed twice while at CSC, and on five occasions at six week intervals after joining their prisons. Interviews were taped in the men's homes by a single research assistant who participated in the CSC course as a correctional officer, though his research identity was known. A further interview was done with a small group of six men while their wives were interviewed separately by our research assistant's wife to

to get information as to the impact of prison work on family life.

d. Interviews were also carried out with four selectors and members of personnel staff regarding selection board and posting procedures.

e. The Report on the work was submitted on time in September 1974, but its dissemination was limited by the then Commissioner of Penitentiaries. It was published in an abridged form as "the Fish Screw" in the Queen's Law Journal, Vol. 3, No. 3, Summer 1977.

f. The findings of the study are summarised briefly at Appendix A to this Report.

3. Developments since the Initial Project

a. Since 1973 there has been a slow but very sporadic increase in the research literature on custodial staff. The most substantial is a study of discipline officers in the English Prison Service by Eric Colvin (1976) which covers ground similar to that in our 1973 project, though it does not include induction training; the approach is that of the sociology of occupations, and it presents a picture of a cohesive group with a definite conception of their role as custodians and disciplinarians. There is evidence that a tradition exists in the English Service, and the sense of belonging and cohesion is enhanced by the extent to which the men and their families lived in quarters "on the post" and maintained an active social life in officers' clubs with other prison staff. As in much of the British work there is instructive attention to union activity, with evidence of the solidarity and militancy which has recently manifested itself in the serious staff-management conflicts that led to the appointment of the May Committee (1979). Declining morale among custodial staff in Britain is also the focus of a recent book

by Peter Evans (1980) which is not yet to hand. A recent smattering of American articles is mainly descriptive, depicting "guards" as marginal workers in a field in which their responsibilities for security and surveillance set them apart from other staff whose roles are construed less easily as being oppressive or punitive. In the US it would seem that efforts have been made recently to reconstruct the traditional role of the guard so that the "helping aspects" are maximised, and those concerned with the maintenance of order and restraint are played down. The result seems to have produced confusion in a setting in which penal policy has sought to promote and emphasize "rehabilitation" while simultaneously preserving an unremitting demand for rigorous security. While efforts to upgrade the social recognition of custodial work can be discerned, there does not seem to have been any noticeable change in what is, undoubtedly, a distinctly negative tradition.

b. In Canada the division of the custodial service has been consolidated into roles involving counselling and other face-to-face work with prisoners in the so-called living units, and those concerned mainly with security. Also the induction course for custodial staff has been lengthened to 12 weeks and newcomers are no longer conditioned to prison work in institutions beforehand. The staff uniform has been redesigned and issued universally, and it is now optional for senior administrative staff at all levels of the operational and training elements. It is notable also that there have been some attempts to formalise the "rites de passage" through the levels of qualification within the CCS; formal presentations of graduation certificates are made to new officers in the correctional grades and ceremonial "handovers"

occur between the wardens of prisons. From a personal communication with the present Commissioner it is evident that these measures are designed to enhance morale, self-respect and a sense of identification with the CCS.

c. A particularly striking change since 1973, when most of our subjects joined the CCS (a few had been in before that), is in the rates of pay. These are shown below: the basic rate for 1973 and the rates after four years in the rank, which all our men had by 1980. Rates are given for CX-COF only as the subjects in LUO grades had been in them for varying times, but it can be assumed that their relative gains were not less than those who remained CXs.

| | 1973 Basic Rate | 1979 4 years + in rank | Gain | Percent Increase (rounded) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CX-COF-1 | $6,688 | $19,750 | $13,062 | 195 |
| 2 | $6,870 | $20,205 | $13,335 | 194 |

Thus it would seem that, even for those who have not been upgraded, the salaries of CX and LU staff have increased at rates which at least keep abreast of changes in the costs of living.

## THE CURRENT PROJECT

4. Aim. This was to examine any changes that had occurred since 1973 in the views of the subjects, and where appropriate their partners, regarding the work they did in the prison and its impact on their lives, in the family and in the immediate community. We wanted to trace the effects of the early training at the Correctional Staff College, and to see whether their careers in the CCS had developed according to their expectations. And especially we wanted to compare various indicators of morale as they might have changed

during the period by relating these to changes in penal policy and in the subjects' own conceptions of their roles.[1] More broadly, our overall purpose was to develop further our understanding of the process of imprisonment as seen from the particular standpoint of custodial staff.

5. Basic Assumptions

a. Our basic assumptions regarding prisons and prison work were the same as in the original research for which two models or "yardsticks" were developed against which we could assess the data: one of a penal system, the other of an incumbent whose duties were mainly custodial. In devising these models it was assumed that, since penal arrangements would be likely to include places for incarcerating offenders for the foreseeable future, their presence had to be taken as given. But it was assumed also that their task should not involve punishment beyond the order of a court, that their charges should be in custody, and that their goal should be to carry out this task without damaging the prisoners or staff; on the contrary the aim of each model should be constructive. Regarding the latter aim, our theoretical models emphasised the salient importance of inducing self-respect among staff and inmates by permeating standards that block the tendency for incarcerative regimes with confused objectives to become torpid manifestations of bored resignation, to which ritual seems the only technique of survival. The two models were:

Model 1 - A Penal System

i. The objectives or goals will be clear, and consistent with the salient values of the host society. They will be stated so that they are neither ambiguous nor contradictory.

ii. These objectives or goals will be reflected and actualised throughout

---

1. Role means the "part" that an incumbent thinks others expect him to perform in doing his job properly

the system, but especially in certain key roles.

iii. The three principal activities - selection, training, and operations (or modus operandi) will be geared manifestly to the objectives or goals.

iv. There will be a reasonable degree of unanimity among members about the integrity and "worthwhileness" of the objectives or goals, and about the worthwhileness of what they themselves are doing.

v. There will be no marked discordance between the objectives or goals and the informal ways of members. (There will be no serious degree of that type of dysfunction in which informal practices produce outcomes inconsistent with formal objectives.)

vi. The form(s) of authority will reflect prevailing ideas about legitimacy in the host society, i.e. there will be general agreement that those with power are the ones who ought to have it.

vii. There will be flexibility and provision for change, without inducing instability and confusion.

viii. There will be provision for quick, unambiguous communication as a reciprocal process between individuals at all levels. The real and personal forms, or "touch", will prevail over the use of symbolic forms, e.g. directives, written orders, etc. Exclusion (of individuals) from information will be limited to instances in which personal safety or self-respect are jeopardised.

ix. There will be incentive to increase knowledge related to the objectives or goals.

x. There will be no marked differences in job satisfaction as between members at different levels, and especially those in key roles.

xi. There will be provision for vertical and horizontal movement of members in the structure itself, and between it and other related organisations. The reasons for movement, e.g. promotion or change of role, will be rational,

and never seem to be capricious.

It may be thought that these criteria have been chosen subjectively to accord with our personal views and experience. To some extent this is undeniable, but it must be stressed also that there is a considerable body of knowledge about malfunction and dissonance in formal organisations, including military formations (e.g. Stouffer et al. 1949), prisons (Morris and Morris 1963, Mathiesen, 1964, 1971), hospitals (Goffman, 1961; Stanton and Schwartz, 1954; Caudill, 1958 and many others) and an even greater variety of work about industrial relations stemming from the early work of Elton Mayo and his associates. The above criteria take account of much of this, but the most realistic test of each one is to ask whether a penal agency can work even adequately if the opposite of the criterion obtains. To some extent, however, the asking of such a question must be conditioned by knowledge of the objectives or goals of the penal agency as a whole; and this is to ask the perennial question what is prison for?

In constructing the model the writer has assumed that prisons exist with two related objectives: to act as one of the means to protect members of society from extreme kinds of predatory behaviour, and secondly to be a means of changing prisoners so that they can live in society without committing crimes. They also must exist as one way of expressing a deeply rooted belief among humans that wrongdoing of an extreme kind must be punished by some kind of symbolic banishment. And it is a regrettable fact that prisons now exist also to act as one of the last resorts for the housing of the indigent, homeless and unwanted.

Model 2 - A Correctional Officer (Basic Grades)

1. He (or she) must embody and symbolise the objectives of the agency,

i.e. he must NOT be predatory or destructive, but sincerely believe that a life free of crime can be happy and worthwhile. He must enjoy life, as opposed to being an unhappy misfit.

ii. He must have faced substantial challenges in his life, and have survived with advantage to his self-respect.

iii. He must be mature and have wisdom, i.e. be a man of the world with ongoing educated interest in it, generally, as well as in the host society.

iv. He must have the capacity and sensitivity to empathise with a wide variety of others--superiors, colleagues and clientele. Perhaps a sense of responsibility towards others is another way of putting this.

v. He must have presence and colour as a character. This is hard to define, and is perhaps more easily stated in the opposite, i.e. he should NOT be colourless, a nonentity, "wet", etc.

vi. It follows that he must be interested in his job, and have the knowledge necessary to make it more than a ritual.

vii. He must prove to himself and to others, his competence in the skills necessary to his work by regular exposure to situations, real and contrived, that test them.

viii. He must be physically and mentally capable of sustaining protracted stress; in other words physically and mentally fit.

ix. He must be able to express himself clearly and confidently, orally and in writing.

x. He must be honest, i.e. a "man of his word" who inspires trust in others.

b. During the earlier research we were interested particularly in the impact on the CCS of the policy dividing custodial staff into security and living-unit components (see 3b above). Its reception among serving correctional

staff was then highly ambivalent: hope of a rise in status and pay was mixed with resentment at creating a group of "second class citizens", and suspicion of therapeutic psychology as facilitating easy manipulation by the shrewder prisoners. (Hence the common use among the men of terms like "loving units" and "den mothers" (for living unit officers). There was also much adverse speculation about the motives of applicants for living unit training, e.g. "they're in it for the money, and that's it." Though we were rather pessimistic about the living unit policy and some apparent discrepancies from our model for a correctional officer, we were anxious to use the follow-up research to find out how the new arrangements were faring, especially according to those subjects who had experience of living units since 1973.

c. We were interested also in the extent to which the introduction of the living unit role into the custodial context (which had previously dominated the prison at all levels) had affected the apparent uniqueness of the traditional role of the "guard". From our previous work, and at the outset of this project, it seemed that the latter was a unique role to which comparisons were both dangerous or, indeed, impossible. We wondered if the role of the living officer could be regarded as equally unique. The point seems to be important, given the frequent tendency to compare apparently similar roles for the several purposes of personnel policy; it is also relevant to understanding staff morale since, like that of "guard" the role of LUO has no positive tradition as yet, and one wonders on what principles its ideals, models or images are being based. In thinking about this we were conscious that the matter might be beyond the scope of the present study, and be more appropriate to a separate or more comprehensive project.

d. Another concern we wanted to pursue was the apparent confusion among our men about the power-relationships in their prisons or, in plain words, about who was running the show. As many of them had been promoted or moved, one could perhaps expect that their views would have become clearer as they came to understand the organisation better. Also relevant to this concern was an evident increase in the involvement of the union in power relations, especially since the disturbance at Millhaven in 1976 and the subsequent Parliamentary Sub-Committee of inquiry in 1977.

e. Finally we wished to look again at the possibility that a salient factor in the correctional officer's capacity to withstand the marked stresses of an unique milieu is the quality of his domestic life. We noted that the survival rate in the CCS of the men with marital or domestic partners among the 20 in the original intake was 8/12, compared with 3/8 of those who were living without partners in domestic life: a suggestive difference that was made more interesting by the content of the 6 interviews we did with partners in 1973.[1] Hence there was a special incentive to interview all the partners of the present group to probe this particular issue.

METHODOLOGY

6. As in the previous research our first step was to inform the senior officers of the USGE about the purpose of the project, how it was initiated and the methodology intended. Despite an offer to do a briefing in person, a circular letter was sent during April 1980 by HQ Eastern Region to which the locals responded favourably and undertook to inform their members

1. In the event we interviewed 11 men and their partners in the current study, as an additional subject had rejoined when the work began.

should be approach them. We were later informed by HQ Eastern Region CCS that the union preferred to defer a face-to-face meeting until after the field work was completed.

7. As we were told that funds for the project were not plentiful it was decided to plan for only one interview with each man remaining in the CCS by June 1980 and his co-habitant. We assumed an interview lasting about ninety minutes as this seemed reasonable for men involved in shift work who might be reluctant to give up their time. As before, we planned to carry out the interviews by appointment in the subjects' homes at their convenience, and to record these on tape for subsequent transfer to a typed transcript which, with the tapes, could be used by an independent evaluator to verify the content of the report eventually to be submitted to the sponsors.

8. Owing to the subjects' differing work patterns, the interviews had to be spread over two months, in fact June and July, though there was one unexpected latecomer to the study in September. Hence there was probably some forewarning of the subjects seen later in the project by their predecessors but this could not be avoided. So far as could be seen, it made no appreciable difference to the results, and there was no evidence of subjects being "primed" about what to say.

9. The procedures were submitted to both the Head of the Sociology Department at Queen's, and to the Associate Dean (Research) in the School of Graduate Studies and Research with a view to setting up an Ethics Review, but as the methodology of the project was so similar to its predecessor (which had been approved formally by an Ethics Review Committee), it was decided that no further review was necessary.

10. We were able to engage for the interviews Mr. and Mrs. Wale who had carried them out in the earlier phase and so were known to all the men and to some of their partners. During March and April 1980 the interview procedure as worked out and a loosely structured design was developed (Appendices B and C) assuming separate but concurrent interviews with the men by Mr. Wale, and with their partners by Mrs. Wale. The structure was not piloted first as both interviewers were already familiar with the subjects and the interview material; hence it seemed sufficient to rely on the first two interviews to make any adjustments, rather than delaying the work and increasing costs by piloting.

11. The questions began with non-controversial biographical material, before moving on to the matters cited in paragraph 5 above. We left time at the end for any comments subjects wished to make that had not been covered previously. And, if time permitted we asked some questions about controversial issues not covered in the previous study, in which we had a special interest i.e. the problems presented by the presence of an increasing number of prisoners serving the minimum "life" sentences, the incidence of homosexuality and its effects on "peaceful co-existence" among prisoners and custodians. We also wanted to ask about opportunities provided for subjects to keep fit physically.

12. Our experience in the earlier phase led us to favour an interview structure that permitted plenty of freedom for respondents to extrapolate from the prescribed questions. Subjects "warm up" at different stages in the interview and we did not want to cut off answers as this process was starting. In other words, we thought it profitable to let subjects "ramble" and develop once they had begun to "open up", especially when they felt

strongly about what they wanted to say.

13. On completing interviews each interviewer was, as in the earlier phase, required to compose a "pen picture" of the subjects' appearance, general demeanour and apparent willingness to co-operate. The general ambience of the household was also to be described, including apparent relationship between members, their life-style, and material comforts e.g. the house itself and its furnishing.

14. As before, it was vital to assure our subjects of complete confidentiality by promising that their responses would be presented so that none could be identified personally. This was more difficult to arrange in this project as the numbers were so small (11 men and their partners); and as all were working in a limited number of local prisons it was inevitable that their names would be known to their employers since, as an initial step, we had to find out from the personnel branch who was still serving and where they were located. An added problem was our wish to avoid the use of restrictive questionnaires, or highly structured interviews specifying a limited range of "closed response" items; though these are probably best for complete anonymity and for quantifying data, they did not seem to be appropriate for such a small population from which we wanted candid, critical and sensitive comments which are, by definition, very individual. Nearly all our subjects were working at different levels in very different situations to the extent that generalisations might well be misleading, or so trite as to mean nothing. We were therefore faced with a conflict between eroding the real meaning of the responses so that there could be no risk of identification, or devising a mode of presentation that would limit these risks as far as possible while putting enough life into the material for it

to convey to readers how our subjects saw their world at work and at home.

15. Hence we decided to use what might be called a combination of descriptive and "quotational" methods in presenting the data, taking care to disguise the latter without, we hope, distorting the responses. We therefore eschewed quantitative illustrations, and did not use the Likert type measures of attitude changes that we had employed in the earlier project--mainly as the numbers were too small for these to have meaning.

16. An additional insurance against breaches of confidentiality was our insistence that all workers on the project sign(ed) a formal undertaking not to divulge the contents of interviews for at least one year after their completion, nor at any time to connect the content with any named person or position in the CCS. This condition applied also to the evaluator whose employment was conditional on guaranteed independence from the research workers and from the CCS.

17. During the first two or three interviews subjects expressed some concern that they had not been told anything about the "findings" of the earlier project. It seemed, on inquiry, that nothing about the earlier Report had been disseminated through the CCS during or since its submission in late 1974. We therefore arranged for copies of an article giving an abridged version of the research findings to be made available to all subjects. After doing so it was found that there was no disagreement with the contents save one instance in which it was thought that too much emphasis had been placed on the incidence of unemployment among the men before they joined the CCS for training, so creating an unjustifiably negative impression. Generally, however, it was reassuring to find that the work was regarded favorably and

as credible by the participants.

THE SUBJECTS

16. Of the eleven men, all but one had served continuously in the CCS since they were seen last in 1973; the other man had been out of the Service for six months and had then rejoined. With the exception of the latter, all had served in various prisons of the Eastern Region: most in at least two different places. Eight were in the CS-COF (Security) grades, and all but two had advanced to supervisory ranks. Three men were Living Unit Officers (LUOs) in the basic grade, but at least two of the men in the security grades had living unit experience. The median age for the group was 31 years at the time interviewed, with a range from 29 to 38. All the men had about seven years' service, none less than that. All were married, four for the second time, and their present marriages had been in existence for at least five years: the longest period was 17 years. Each of the couples had children, most of them two or more.

17. Several men had undertaken further education outside the CCS but had abandoned it, including one who had started a degree course by correspondence. All except one--or so it appeared--had taken promotion examinations successfully, though in not every case had the incumbent retained the new rank. There were, however, no reported instances of involuntary changes in employment which did not suit the personal wishes of the men concerned.

18. In all but three cases the interviewer remarked on the men being in "good shape"; the exceptions were tending to overweight and to various overt signs of stress. As we shall show, the stresses of this unusual work could be inferred quite quickly though they were not very evident in overt signs.

Heavy drinking was often mentioned, but there was no marked evidence of it at interview. The subjects' appearance was noted as "neat and well turned out", and neither interviewer expressed cause for concern in this respect.

19. Most of the men reported hobbies and there were several instances of quite considerable involvement in community work, e.g. coaching minor league sport teams. Though it was not said specifically, it would not be imprecise to infer that much of this was a "safety valve" to get away from the stress of the daily work, and it was noticeable (see below) that many men preferred to avoid spending leisure hours with colleagues.

20. Standards of accommodation and the life-styles of the subjects were reported as "comfortable", and there was no evidence of material deprivation. Indeed it is interesting that only one of the men admitted to "moonlighting"; in the other cases the normal renumeration plus occasional overtime seemed enough. Though in some cases partners were working and saw their contributions as essential, there were instances in which the men encouraged employment outside home to offset any tendency to be affected too much by waiting and worrying about the man's safety.

21. Signs of disharmony or instability were not evident in our perception of domestic relationships which seemed, in the short period of contact, to be pleasant and normal. Even so it was evident that it could not have been easy at times to manage the apparently quite frequent situation in which men returned from work very "up tight": "bringing the job home", "treating the family like inmates" and so on. Where, however, "problems" were reported, there is no reason to suppose from the evidence that they were sufficiently unusual or remarkable to impress the interviewers as "serious". (It may be noted here that Mrs. Wale was engaged in social work concurrently with the interviewing.)

22. The eleven partners were about the same ages as their men. Five had been in the previous research and a further one was well known to Mrs. Wale. As noted in para 14, all were experienced home-makers and, with one exception, whose baby was very young, mothers also; four had been married previously. Six had jobs outside the home from which one could infer that most were "white collar workers", and none could be called "working class"[1]; two were in occupations of the "social control" type. The general impression given by the women was of stable, pleasant and mature personalities. They seemed to be committed very fully to their men's welfare. Indeed this commitment may explain a noticeable reticence in many to say anything that might jeopardise their partner's standing in the eyes of his employers. With a few exceptions it appeared, perhaps unfairly to them, that the women decided for various reasons to be very careful about what they said during the interviews.

## THE MATERIAL FROM THE TAPED INTERVIEWS

23. The following represent the salient points made by the subjects in the taped interviews. They are presented in the approximate order in which the issues were set out in the structure at Appendices B and C, though there are variations to make this account more digestible. At risk of being repetitive, however, one must emphasise the considerable difficulty in presenting this material without identifying individuals in this small group of subjects.

24. Recollections of the Induction Course in 1973

a. Memories of the course were vague and it is clear that the men found it difficult to disentangle what they had learned that was useful on the job from what they had absorbed in their day-to-day work. On reflection it was thought that the more practical parts of the course were "good", but there

---

1. By "working class" we mean unskilled manual workers whose life style and social status reflect, more or less permanently, their marginal occupational status.

was frequent criticism that what was taught was too far removed form the actual practice in the prisons, despite the appreciation that each place had its own special way of doing things. In the comments on induction training we heard the often repeated complaint that there was too little consultation (if any at all) between the planners at the various headquarters and those who do the job. (A resurgence of the evidence from the previous research of an apparent lack of integration between the training and operational elements of the system.)

b. It seemed that the standing of the Induction Course has improved in the eyes of operational staff since our subjects did it. It is difficult to be sure about this, however, as very few of the men had direct contact with new recruits and so were hesitant to comment about how they were received in the host prisons as compared with their own experience. But enough was said to suggest that the old "treat Calderwood as a holiday and forget all you learned there" attitude among the peer group has ceased to be salient. It is interesting that most men thought it sound to abandon the previous practice of giving experience in local prisons before the induction course and so avoid the cynicism among aspirants that had to be broken through; the extension of the course from eight to twelve weeks was also thought to be good. From the interviews it seems that the CSC and its staff enjoy more respect among operational staff than in 1973, but it is hard to say whether this derives from the standard of recruits graduated from the induction courses or from the very apparent popularity of the post-induction courses; it seems that there is definite enthusiasm for getting places on the latter and most negative comments about the CSC were related to the difficulty of getting assignments to it.

25. Post-Induction Training in the CCS

a. Throughout the interviews there were expressions of enthusiasm for more training for correctional work; and the interesting thing is that it was not often related to qualifying for more money or higher rank so much as to being

equipped better to do the job. Apropos of the latter, much was made as before of the need for more and better weapon training, but there was particular reference to the necessity for training in handling crises. Though the courses offered--unfortunately it seemed only occasionally--in using firefighting equipment were appreciated, our questioning showed a disquieting absence of training for handling prisoners in fires, bombings and other highly disruptive situations.

b. The men seemed especially interested in the training and work of the Emergence Response Teams (ERTs) which appeared to project the same kind of attraction that corps d'elite often do. It seemed that the innovation of these teams has done quite a lot to raise the morale and self-respect of custodial workers, probably because the ERT task militates against the stereotypical picture of custodial work being routinised, monotonous and dull.

c. Some of the credibility of the ER teams and the training was diminished by the frequent criticisms about the tendency to fail to provide booster or refresher instruction. Indeed it was noticeable in the earlier project that there was little or no following up and refreshment of skills and knowledge gained in the formal courses of instruction: possibly a consequence of the difficulty of providing it in the operational prisons.

d. Much was made of the acute difficulties of running credible and useful training sessions in the prisons. Indeed it seems to be almost impossible to do so while simultaneously making the necessary staff available to keep the prisons running. Changing audiences and marked limitations on time were mentioned as precluding sequential or thematic courses; hence the enthusiasm for getting away to the CSC as the only practical way of receiving consecutive instruction. Even so, praise was given for the visits of skilled instructors, e.g. in handling fire equipment and for a set of courses on "life skills".

It seemed, however, that neither adequate time nor incentives were offered for gaining additional knowledge, and it may not be going too far to suppose that the men who had dropped courses offered from outside the CCS, e.g. at community colleges, had done so because verbal and financial encouragement was lacking.

26. Attitudes to Role

a. When asked about their roles[1] in the CCS and how they "fitted into the system", none of the subjects could answer in terms of stated objectives and work geared to them beyond simple statements like "I suppose security's the name of the game" (an almost universal remark during most interviews) or--among the LUOs--"helping the cons to stay on the street and not come back here". Moreso than in 1973 the subjects seemed to regard their work in a compartmental manner and found it difficult to see it as part of a whole that they could understand. The general view was of a "system" that was chaotic and inconsistent in regard to handling both staff and prisoners.

b. Asked about attractive and unattractive aspects of the work, nearly all cited pay and regular employment as the former, with only LUOs adding that there were interesting and quite intellectually demanding aspects of LU work, e.g. writing up reports on prisoners for parole review. But all said that "security is the name of the game", whatever work they were doing. And it was security that was cited most often as the unattractive side of their work. Clearly the subjects regarded security work as dull, monotonous and uninteresting; the rare "favorable" comments made on it reflected the man's satisfaction with work that made no intellectual demands on him and could be "switched off" at the end of a shift. As we have said, it may be that the enthusiastic attitudes towards ERT work derived from the idea that

1. See footnote page supra.

it did something to make "security" interesting; otherwise it seems that the picture of security workers as "second class citizens" revealed by the first phase of this research is unchanged.

c. It must be said, however, that our question about "attractive" aspects of the work were often received with comments such as "you must be kidding" and there is no doubt that the very slender instance of reliable and reasonably paid work stretched the subjects' imagination. They found it easier--probably as most working men do--to cite the unattractive things. Apart from the monotony and "low caste" of security work, men stressed as they had before, the hostility and abusiveness of some prisoners; and those who had jobs that kept them distant from prisoners seemed to appreciate the respite though, as we show below, some thought the tensions between staff and prisoners had lessened since our last interviews. As before, it was not difficult to infer that the working environment on the ranges of Canadian federal prisons is neither friendly nor happy: that which is peaceful and reasonably tolerable is due to the absence of overt strife which can, nevertheless, be expected to break out at any moment without warning.

d. With the possible exception of some LUOs and staff on such work as Social Development, the men did not expect or get much from the prisoners to aid his own self-respect. Nor, apparently, did much support for the ego come from superiors, and several men remarked that "pats on the back" never came though there was criticism in plenty. None of the men reported anything that might be interpreted as encouragement from above to enhance their self-respect; they seemed more to look for victimisation and scapegoating. Also some cited lack of appreciation as one of the disincentives to seek more responsibility or promotion as if to say, "they'll think no more of you for

trying." In the prisons themselves it seems, from the interviews, that nothing is done to make custodial staff feel that they are appreciated, and one is reminded of the plaintive comment of a subject in the earlier study that "we're a necessary evil I suppose". Certainly the evidence in this material, overt and what can be inferred, amply supports this view.

e. It is interesting that the dangers of the work did not come out during the comments on "unattractive" aspects, and were apparent only when the men were asked about them directly; we deal with this directly below, but the reasons for omission at this point seemed to have more to do with excluding the unpleasant from one's mind, than with its non-existence. It seemed that this was something one learned to live with if the work was to be continued. In most instances the men did not appear to have much pride in their work; they did not regard it highly themselves, and they certainly thought that the public held a negative view of it. When we asked if they would encourage their children to join the CCS, the answers were mostly negative and, where they were not, the issue was avoided by saying that nothing would be discouraged if it was "reasonable" and "that was what he wanted to do". Generally, CX work was seen as lowly; as the sort of thing anyone can do if shown. It should, however, be remembered that most parents want their children to "have something better than we've had".

f. The low opinion of the work was reflected in the very limited ambition of most of the men who saw very little advantage in promotion since, in many cases, it would remove eligibility for overtime and this was not offset by the differences of pay as between grades, which were seen as marginal only. Financial inducements alone did not seem to attract; only those inducements that make the job more interesting were sought, and here we found the Living

Unit had the same kind of appeal that it had in 1973. Its image has remained quite positive, despite the unexpectedly high proportion of the work that is said to be "security", and there was a general view that it is perhaps the only really constructive work open to the CX grades without formal qualifications that are portable outside the CCS.

g. With one or two exceptions, the men seemed resigned to a status that would unlikely be high enough to give them real respect for themselves in terms of occupation. As in the earlier study there was a marked frustration evident in the resentment of "degree people" who were seen to have unjust advantages; yet, despite this, we have noted above that the only subject who undertook a degree course dropped it before completion. Whatever the real reasons for his action may have been, there seems to be no doubt that "self-improvement" through higher education is not readily facilitated, nor does it seem to be thought worthwhile if what our subjects did not say is an indication of what is, in fact, the case.

27. Career Expectations

a. Though most of the men were not displeased with the development of their careers in the CCS, it seemed that their expectations had been satisfied mainly by the material benefits attained in private life.

b. There was no mention of encouragement or direction as to improving career prospects and it seemed to lie with the men whether or not they made moves; typically, "competitions are announced and guys put in for them if they want to". The competitions were said to be undemanding, and dependent on the capacity to regurgitate notes taken on the induction or other CSC courses, and to memorise administrative directives. Rote learning was said, as in 1973, to be more important than understanding and, again as before,

it was stressed that the knowledge required in the tests was not relevant to the actual duties or procedures used "on the job", but was "academic". We noted this particularly as one of the ideas that are implicit in the men's view of their work that it is largely a matter of ritual: "going through the motions without much reasoning why you do it".

c. Though it was said that the "boards" were quite easy, difficulties were cited about meeting pre-requisites where opportunities to take the courses set were hindered by the nature of the job. And, as before, the essential most frequently cited in response to the question as to what " is needed to get on in the CCS" was "who you know". There was a rooted belief that "upsetting" one's seniors is likely to be fatal to career prospects for ever, and there was no mention of opportunities for "redemption". On the other hand, promotion boards were said to be "fairer" than before and less likely to be influenced by such things as membership of Royal Canadian Legion or being a Freemason.

d. With the exception of the subjects in the most senior ranks who were not in such direct contact with prisoners, the men seemed convinced that their career prospects were very vulnerable to damaging accusations by prisoners. It was believed that the consequences of an accusation of inappropriate behaviour coming from a prisoner could be more damaging than such an accusation from any other source. However an accusation from a guard that reflected on a prisoner was thought to be far less likely to be damaging to the latter and might, in fact, be overlooked by higher authority as being irrelevant. Moreover it was thought by some that prisoners have direct contact with members of parliament who lose no opportunity to "turn on the heat"; indeed it was said that all ranks of custodial staff are

extremely sensitive to this kind of thing after the experience of the MacGuigan Report of 1977. It would be hard to over-emphasise the depth of feeling with which this kind of observation was made by the men since they seemed to see it as a salient example of their loss of status and authority in relation to prisoners.

e. All the men saw themselves continuing in the CCS to retirement and, in saying this, they emphasised that it was highly improbable that they could move to equally paid work outside. Generally it seemed that they were "relatively well-off" by comparison with most semi-skilled and unskilled blue-collar workers. It is clear that these men do not see themselves as easily "portable" to other work though many (and even more of their partners) said they would prefer it...always given the same material benefits which none thought could be expected, given their experience and qualifications. When asked why they had stayed in the CCS in contrast to about half their intake who had left the Service, the reply was, in so many words, a reluctance to give up reliable and "not unreasonable" remuneration.

28. Uniform and General Bearing

a. In general, attitudes towards wearing uniform were utilitarian: the concern was with saving one's own clothes from wear and tear, and only one man expressed what could be called pride in wearing it. Otherwise it was seen as a barrier to communication with prisoners--those with LUO experience especially noted the marked difference in relationships with prisoners when wearing uniform or plain clothes--and it attracted unwelcome attention when outside the workplace. The style and quality of the new uniform was thought by most to be an improvement. There was no evidence of linking uniform to morale or of any "deeper meaning" being attached to it.

b. In most cases an improvement was noted in appearance and bearing. When the impression was otherwise it was due to the man being overweight and (apparently) "liking his drink" a bit more than would pass without notice; but it is necessary to be cautious about inference since it is hard to assess the difference between "excess", and enjoying a drink after a gruelling day. There were, however, enough references to drinking heavily, and to drinking problems among CX staff, to infer that this is one of the expectable reactions to boredom, routine and the various pressures that these men encounter on the job.

29. Power Relationships

a. The striking aspect of most answers to the question as to where power lies in the CCS or "who runs the show", was the absence of reference to wardens or to "the administration" in the prisons themselves; where there was any definite location it hovered between the security personnel and the prisoners: mainly the latter who were believed to get more or less what they want. "Ottawa" and "Region" were said to set policy, but the resultant action was thought to depend on the intentions of "security" and "the cons". Rather surprisingly, the union seemed to have very low prestige as regards power, beyond negotiating grievances between individual members and the administration, and in dealing with contracts. Despite the apparent contentment with the prevailing remuneration, the Union seemed to get little credit for this.

b. None of the men gave the impression that their prisons or the CCS in general were run as "tight ships" nor, in contrast to the views expressed by several in 1973, did they seem to want this. Their main concerns--and this is perhaps the most strongly indicated "feeling" conveyed from the interviews--

were with their power-relationship vis-a-vis prisoners which, as mentioned already, is perceived to have become one-sided and markedly in favour of the latter. It is interesting that this did not seem to promote a demand for a swing towards punitive or over-rigorous rule enforcement; on the contrary the men seemed to want a sound and--what seemed to them--fair balance of power which would give equal credence to complaints and remove the severe sense of injustice that is now felt.

c. In the present interviews there was much less reference to "wheels" or to particular centres of power, e.g. keepers or "the ex-military old guard". (Though there was occasional criticism of too much enthusiasm in hiring men from the military.) Probably the change in attitudes is due partly to the greater security and status of most of the men. There is certainly a marked impression of a change in power-relationships which no longer seem to emphasise the dominance of tough elements among the guards or the prisoners. It is, however, hard to be sure whether this is due to greater tolerance and willingness to "look the other way" with regard to abuses or--more probably--to a feeling of diffidence about the reality of power as the men saw it. In so many words it might be said that "it all comes out the same whatever we say or do--and we're usually the losers". (Though not an actual quotation, this should convey the meaning that is projected from the interviews in general.)

d. An interesting change since 1973 is in the apparent reduction in the formerly noticeable conflict between prisoners and guards. Though there is still antagonism, the targets for it have moved up the hierarchy of authority from the custodial staff to the more remote "them"--the administration--and sometimes to Region and Ottawa, the higher levels whose influence

is felt but unseen by both prisoners and staff. As in 1973 there was frequent criticism of lack of objectives and lack of direction; it was often said that neither the prisoners nor the lower levels of staff "knew where they stood", and both were irritated by implementations of policy that seemed capricious. Apparently action was expected without reasons being given, and changes were put into effect without those concerned being consulted first. There was, it was said, too much downward flow of directives, and much too little upward flow of information and advice beforehand. There is in this an apparent contradiction in complaining about lack of direction on the one hand, and about insensitive, uninformed direction on the other. One might here infer a lack of integration between policy-making and its implementation at all the different levels of the process, since the lower levels seemed to feel that they were "out of it". It would seem that no-one "reaches downwards" to ensure that all levels of staff understand the goals and steps towards their attainment, whatever these may be. Again there is an impression that the men worked "in compartments" with little understanding of what was going on elsewhere.

e. Some men thought that there was rather less friction between guards and prisoners due to the reduction in the power to the former and the greater opportunity for the latter to complain to wardens and assistant wardens who "now decide even the little things". And it is, perhaps, suggestive that one of the more outspoken subjects made a point of stressing that his warden was "too accessible" to prisoners who were able easily to by-pass the uniformed staff. Moreover it has been mentioned above (in para 27d) that there is a belief among staff that parliamentarians are unusually sensitive to complaints from prisoners about staff. That staff have votes and prisoners

do not is an interesting afterthought in this connection.

30. The Union

a. With one or two exceptions the men reported little or no participation in the Union activities and there was no great respect for its influence, though most thought it could be an effective voice for individual members when they had problems. Curiously, and perhaps significantly, many did not think of it as a union but as "only an alliance", acting as a bridge between the employers and the membership in a co-operative relationship rather than as a militant and confronting power. However there was no reference, as there had been frequently in the earlier research, of desiring another union though this could be implied from the apparent acceptance of the developments towards the CCS becoming a "separate employee"; in no instance did this arouse any apprehension, though we did not have time to go into the implications of it in depth. Generally men seemed to be wary of becoming involved too closely with union activities, and especially with seeking "office", as they thought this would work against their chances of advancement and would not "sit well" with higher authority. This kind of view was more typical of the senior ranks who may be more cautious about such commitments; the others seemed to be more militant and critical of the employers, but even they did not regard the union as a strong force in the power structure, nor show any strong commitment to it.

b. The role of the Union was seen as being concerned mainly with pay and material benefits and, as before, no thoughts were evinced about its potential to advance the status of the CX through lobbying for better training and educational opportunities, nor were the needs of families mentioned, such as improved provision for widows' benefits. (Maybe this

is one of the several indications of a complacent attitude among these men.) Generally it is evident that the Union did not have a high profile in the prisons in which our men worked, and it lay outside their sphere of interest unless they had grievances individually. Nevertheless there was support and appreciation of the colleagues who took on the work, but the picture is of an active minority and a passive majority in the normal course of events.

31. The Living Unit Concept

a. In contrast to the markedly ambivalent attitude of most of the men to security work, that of the living unit was seen as "more interesting", "more worthwhile", "more professional", and in general more rewarding in personal relationships all round; hence one could infer that it enhanced the self-respect of the LUOs. That this improvement in self-regard might be at the expense of the relative esteem given to colleagues in security could be inferred from a number of comments. One was the view that the latter--and especially senior ranks--expressed their resentment at their loss of power over prisoners by being too enthusiastic in adopting "gang busting tactics, coming in with billies swinging" when there were signs of trouble on the ranges. "Security" staff were seen as having been "down on the LU idea" from its inception, and it seemed that the rivalry and ill-feeling between the LUOs and the security men that was incipient in the earlier study had not diminished. It is, however, interesting that most LUOs thought that the view (of security staff) that the LU concept had reduced standards of security was illusory since the proximity of staff to prisoners in the LUs made supervision and control much closer. Another indication of this view was the previously mentioned remark from some LUOs that "security is still the name of the game", even in the LUs; as one man said, "I say I'm a counsellor

and some inmates take this, but others say 'you're a screw, a guard', and everyone knows that's the bottom of the heap." The LUOs, and many of the other subjects, referred often to "guard work" as "degrading" and it was evident that its status had not improved in the least since the 1973 research; the common stereotype of the guardsseemed still to be of rather bellicose men with little patience for finesse in dealing with prisoners.

b. There was frequent criticism of the standards of selection for LU work, and LUOs were uneasy about the reliability of some colleagues in crisis situations and the ease with which the "wrong sort of guys can create trouble for everyone". Some suggested a need for close supervision and more frequent reviews of competence than existed at the time of interview. Also there was concern about what was believed to be a deliberate policy of -- creating more positions in LU work for degree entrants; as noted in 1973 there was still resentment among the CX ranks about preferences given to "degree people" and at "having to teach kids fresh out of college" to occupy positions superior in status to their own. Clearly it would seem that the friction between those with degrees on the so-called "professional" staff and the CX grades that was noticeable in 1973 has not diminished. There were frequent comments about those with professional qualifications "thinking they know it all" and not appreciating the potential contributions of the CX men, and the same persistent complaints about a growing preponderance of "chiefs" over "indians". Again there was evidence of the fondness for euphemistic and high-sounding titles which brought sceptical comments from the men; "we're going to be called case managers now, and there's a new name for the classification officers--LUDOs (living unit development officers); seemingly nomenclature is a vexed issue that might well deserve closer

analysis since the credibility and respect accorded to incumbents can easily be eroded by inappropriate titles.

c. Men with LU experience seemed to doubt the efficacy of the range meetings, though the reasons were not specified beyond impatience with spending time on pointless talking and grumbling (all of which are understandable in a protracted custodial setting). But there was evident satisfaction in the feeling the men conveyed at being able to affect the life-chances of prisoners more positively than in security work; they valued the opportunity to prepare case reports and to present evidence to boards dealing with temporary absence and parole. Hence the view, mentioned above, that the work is "more professional" than "guarding", which seems to suggest that the term "professional" might be more appropriate in the men's view to the stereotypes of psychologists and others, whose qualifications are portable beyond the prison, rather than to stereotypes that seem to be tied to prison work.

d. There was comment also about the failure to adapt Standing Orders in the prisons to the LU system where it had been introduced; hence the orders were seen as irrelevant and "nonsense". This was one more instance of the apparently commonly held view that the formal organisation of the CCS does not reflect the way in which things are actually done in the prisons. This seems to be one more form of the frequent complaint of those in the operational elements of an organisation that the policy-makers are too remote and unpractical in their thinking about "what goes on" at the front!

e. Perhaps the best way to show how the men with LU experience felt about the living unit concept is to quote, virtually verbatim, the response of one subject to our question about the "way in which the living unit idea is

working out".

> "I'm not a con lover and I know of very few LUOs that are. My view is that the living unit was designed to rehabilitate inmates and they don't seem to have realised that you can't do that yet. What I've seen it as is a way of exerting some positive influence on a few inmates who have decided within themselves that they are finished, and we can then provide a swifter way to the street. That is about the only positive aspect as far as the counselling part of the job is concerned. The other side of it is that the institution is probably more secure than a non-living unit institution, simply because the living unit officers are directly involved one hundred per cent of the time with the same inmates. We've discovered escape attempts and things, so there's probably more benefit to be derived from security than there is for the actual rehabilitation of the inmate. Therefore the main idea of the whole thing has not materialised. The biggest benefit has been a more secure institution."

32. Relationships with Prisoners

a. Towards the end of the 1973 research we had noted a hardening of attitudes towards prisoners after the men left the CSC, but there were no reasons from the current interview material to note any deterioration. Clearly the men resented what they believed to be increasing concessions to prisoners at the expense of their own power and status, and one might infer reasonably that much of the marked adherence among the partners (reported below) to the "principle" of "less eligibility" (that the position of the prisoner should always be less eligible than that of the lowest paid honest worker) was derived from their men's views.

b. Running through the interview material is a rather pessimistic note about the prison experience or prison workers doing much to influence the "cons", and there was an unmistakable cynicism about rehabilitation with the expectation that most of the prisoners would return to prison. There were, however, no instances of real hostility or hatred of prisoners despite the abuse to which many of these men were subjected, and the well-known convention

by which too friendly relationships between them and their charges is discouraged actively on both sides. One had the impression that there was much mutual toleration, providing that the "peace" of neither group was undisturbed.

c. In general the men did not see the presence of prisoners serving life sentences of 25 years, without likelihood of parole, adding very much to the dangers of the job, though many mentioned the obvious fact that these prisoners might have nothing to lose by injuring or killing members of staff. Outbreaks of serious violence from these prisoners were not regarded as more worrying than those instigated by others whose shorter sentences might often be seen by them as demoralising as longer ones. The subjects' main concern was what would be done with the long-sentence prisoners eventually, since it seemed inconceivable to keep them in conditions of the highest security excluded from the social benefits of, for example, the living units. Hence the situation deriving from the presence of these prisoners was seen as both problematic and potentially explosive. Some mentioned that the conjugal visiting programme might alleviate a few of the difficulties, but all stressed the necessity for it to be restricted to men of good behaviour so that "it doesn't become a right to be given away like all the so-called privileges have been." None of the men seemed to be hostile to the conjugal visits at the time we interviewed them, but some partners were strongly against it on--we assumed--the grounds that it eroded further the principle of "less eligibility".

d. At least one indicator that the men's attitudes to prisoners were not unreasonably harsh or intolerant is the type of response that was made

generally to our questions about problems caused by the presence of sex offenders. These aroused no special comments nor expressions of rejective emotion, and there was no reason to think that the men regarded these people with less favour than other prisoners. Their views about the incidence of homosexuality and the problems caused by it were seemingly realistic and balanced and, again, without apparent prejudice. Most thought that between 30 and 40 per cent of prisoners had homosexual relationships at some time while in prison, but that it was a response to the sexual deprivation of imprisonment that ceased on release. There were, however, frequent references to the harassment of young prisoners, new to prison life ("the fish") to intimidate them into trafficking in contraband and other illicit activities for the prisoner community; there were also accounts of "rapes", but it seemed that these were infrequent, and the more usual thing is a tolerated activity between consenting parties. Though homosexuality is present, it would be an overstatement from what our subjects said to call if "rife", as some of the more dramatic press and literature material depict it to be. One instance of the rather unusual situations these men face nowadays was a comment about having a transexual on the range; it is notable that this individual was described (apparently in a compliment) as a "fantastic person", without any hint of ridicule or embarrassment.

As in the earlier interviews there was evidence that staff use physical violence against prisoners and--though there was no reason to suspect sadism--there was no apparent reluctance to use force or to disavow it. A few of the men spoke of being used as "goons" at various times, and they did not appear to think this remarkable or improper; rather more was it seen as a "fact of life" in prisons, and there was no attempt to hide it or to be

embarrassed about it. (There was, however, an unquestionable note of criticism in the comment noted in para 31a above about security staff showing excessive zeal in using their clubs). It is interesting also that few of our men seemed to try to impress on the interviewers that they were "tough guys"; only two told of incidents from which this might be implied, though not with any marked emphasis.

33. Effects on Private Life

a. All the men indicated the remarkable strain of working in a prison and the need for some way of "switching off" when one left work. However it seems that few could do this unless they adopted a mechanical approach to the job (as was evident in the case of some of the less ambitious subjects). Men reported such effects as irritation with their children and a tendency to order family members about. The strain of excessive overtime was evident, and the price was thought to be worth paying for material benefits when the men were building up the kind of domestic situation they sought. Once this was done--as was the case in most instances--the disadvantages of overtime in isolating the man from his family discouraged it. In most cases these were family-centred men whose domestic environment was an evident cushion against work that offered few compensations beyond security of tenure and income. Though there was talk among men and their partners of the work breaking up marriages, this was hearsay and the occasional signs of dissonance between partners was thought to be due to aspects of their lives that could not be attributed readily to prison work. Though there was often reference to heavy drinking, it was usually hearsay also, and it would be easy to over-dramatise the meaning of subjects "sipping beer steadily while being interviewed" since there was nothing strange about this in the circumstances,

and neither of the interviewers reported evidence of alcoholism. The hearsay conveyed messages sufficiently strong, however, for us to infer that heavy drinking is a real problem in responding to the stresses of prison work.

b. There was occasional reference to the risks of mental illness, and it is notable that (according to their partners) the men had no one to whom they could turn with confidence when "up tight". Most relied on their partners as "safety valves" but this leads one to wonder how those who live alone are placed in a situation that must be frequent. Surprisingly we heard little of actual breakdowns, though there was reference to an apparently well-established practice of "phoning in sick" when the stress becomes too great. A few mentioned the desirability of relieving stress by more frequent leaves or by providing periodical employment outside the prison. Time and again it came through via the interviews that prison work on the ranges is unusually stressful, and of such a nature that over-long exposure to it cannot fail to leave as deep a mark on the captors as it does on their charges.

c. With very few exceptions, most of the men's friendships and those of their families were from outside the CCS; indeed several mentioned the wish to avoid mixing too often with fellow workers among whom the "talk is always about the pen". Several reported pleasant and understanding social relationships with police officers and their families with whom they felt they could talk freely. Indeed the men seemed to make every effort they could to live apart from the prison, and some were prepared to drive over twenty miles to and from work to do so. It can be inferred that there would not be much enthusiasm for occupying "quarters" close to the prisons as is done in other

countries! However, several mentioned the disadvantages of living in neighbourhoods where there was a concentration of prisoner's relatives; some had experienced this and found the hostility uncomfortable. In the present interviews there was only one instance of hostility from neighbours that could be attributed to the man's job, though there was frequent reference to rather embarrassing curiosity among friends and acquaintances, and the men seemed glad to be able to fend these off by saying that they were not allowed to talk about their work outside. As in the previous research there were some instances of unhappy incidents at dances and other social gatherings when others would break off contact as soon as they knew what our subject did as a job. Also embarrassing were the instances in which relatives, friends, or even the members of families with whom the men's children were friendly, were committed to prison; a fair example of this was the marked distress experienced by one of our subject's children when a near relative of her best friend was sent to prison. It would seem that the prisons have "long arms" reaching into the most personal relationships of workers' families.

d. Asked about opportunities to keep physically fit, the men reported neither encouragement by the employers, nor the provision of facilities. Any iniatives seemed to have to come from the men themselves, and one anecdote of interest was of a request made directly to Mr. Allmand, when Solicitor-General and visiting a local prison, for the use of an empty building as a gymnasium; his promise to "consider it" was said to have resulted in refusal. (It is interesting that none mentioned the facilities at the CSC which are supposed to be available to personnel in CCS institutions.)

34. Partners' Views

a. Though the eleven partners were anxious to "put a good face" on their lives, it was very evident that they need a lot of inner strength to stand the strain. They were not "grumblers" but it seemed that they "live with the situation" mainly for the comforts and security that the "reasonable" money brings in. It is self-evident that the men's job is unique in itself, and it would be less than credible if their domestic life were not unique also. To the listener of the tapes it seemed that their women were not saying all they might have done; for some reason they appeared to be very cautious and careful what they said, although some knew the interviewer and all seemed to have good rapport with her. We felt that a group discussion-interview might have been more profitable than putting a set of questions individually that could be--and often were -- answered with a minimum of words. However it is clear that the women seemed to appreciate being included in the research.

b. None of the women reported any marked effects on their relationships with children, relations or neighbours because of their man's work, though in one instance residence in a rather tough neighbourhood in Kingston had caused occasional perceived suspicion or even hostility, but nothing overt.

c. In cases where the women had known their men before joining the CCS most reported changes in that the latter had become "harder" and "more cynical" as they had been exposed progressively to the rigours of prison life.

d. In only the one instance (para 33c above) was any effect reported on children's relationships with their friends after the best friend of one broke off relations when her father was sentenced to prison; this was clearly

a very traumatic experience for the children and one that was hard for the subject's partner to handle. Some difficulty was apparent among the women in explaining to their younger children "what daddy did", and the fact that this was difficult may indicate the "unpopular" nature of the work.

e. Several women were familiar with prison work, having relations who had been in the CCS; two were in jobs themselves that could be called "of the social control type" and they said that this enabled them to understand the pressures on their husbands, but though they had sensed that these were considerable, they had not realised how great the strain was. The women spoke of their real need to understand the work the men did so that they could cope better with the moodiness that was manifested at home after return from stressful work. One spoke for several in mentioning the occasional tendency of the man to forget he was relating to his family, and not to prisoners, but it seemed that these incidents were very short lived and not too disruptive.

f. None seemed to feel any embarrassment in going out with their men in uniform, though a few mentioned embarrassing incidents at social gatherings when "people made remarks" or even "cut" them. It was clear that the families kept the man's job as quietly as they could and did not advertise it unless it was necessary. (The men spoke of the same thing in para 32c above.)

g. Though the women were not very explicit about it, one could infer that friends were chosen with more than usual care from people who were either nothing to do with the prison, or from other people in social control jobs, e.g. police, with whom they seemed to have a special affinity. However these were not isolated families, and most women reported involvement in

various kinds of community work.

h. Other evidence of an embarrassed attitude to the men's work was the view of most women that they would prefer their men to do other work, provided that it paid equally well and that the men were happy. Concern over their men's happiness and welfare was very striking, and a salient feature of the interviews was the extent to which the women put their husbands and their children first in their considerations. Their man's life was <u>their</u> life, and in only one case was there any doubt about the totality of the involvement.

i. Most were conscious of the dangers in the work, but none mentioned the dire straits which--at the time of interview--they would have been in had their men been killed or seriously injured. Several complained about insensitivity towards them by the prison administration in having no "drill" for informing them about the reasons for keeping men on duty, especially when crises were known from the media to have occurred. Typically, "I was left worrying and wondering until he walked in several hours late."

j. In some cases the women said that their men seemed to fear that their partners might be targets for prisoner reprisals, and gave that as a reason for not taking them to prison concerts. This caused some friction as the women clearly wanted to go to dances and other social occasions where they could meet the people of whom their men talked. And it was evident that the men did talk a lot "to let off steam", though some kept their work problems to themselves, putting the women under the very strain that they were trying to avoid imposing on them. It was evident that these women (and the men) had a difficult task in handling job-induced stress, and had no help in doing so. One could not help but compare their situation of isolation with that

of army wives, whose group relations were of use in this respect.

k. Though our interviews with the men indicated no marked decrease in toleration for prisoners, and sometimes quite the contrary, the women showed a strong feeling that the prison regimes were too "soft", and gave the prisoners far too many benefits that they did not deserve which were often very difficult for "ordinary people" to acquire. Among the latter, colour TV was often mentioned, and so was the seeming unfairness of convicted criminals being fed better than most people outside could afford. Generally the women were far more punitive than the men and, though they recognised that "some" should not be "inside" the general view was to favour harsher treatment of prisoners with many fewer privileges. Generally the women were not specific about what should be done to make conditions more harsh; they simply wanted it to be evident that imprisonment was punitive and the opposite of the "easy time" it seemed now to be. (And here it cannot be forgotten that their picture of what is, and perhaps what should be, might well have come from their men!)

35. Final Comments Made at Interviews

a. At the conclusion of the formal interviews the men were asked if they had any points they wished to make that had not been covered in the questions. Several questioned about the eventual use of the research, and commented on the lack of information about the first study, for example, "the trouble with these researches is that we give a lot of help but hear no more. Nothing ever seems to happen as a result"...was a common complaint.

b. There was concern expressed about the declining morale of the security workers owing to their exposure to others whose long service had made them sour and time-serving. The probability was seen that the old guards with their resistence to change, and rigid attitudes to discipline could infect the younger ones who might perpetuate the breed. Most, and especially the LUOs and those with experience outside security work, were pessimistic about the future of the security grades which they thought--in line with others actually doing that work--had nothing to offer beyond undemanding, boring routine.

c. Especially notable were the same kinds of complaint about "lack of communication" that we found in the earlier work. "Things happen without warning, and without anyone telling you why or when." "No one tells the guards who are thought to be a bunch of turkeys. No one ever listens to them...right?" Continually through the interviews with the men in the lower grades comes the impression that nothing is done to boost their self-respect, and there was wistful reference to the conspicuous absence of praise for anything from anyone. Though it was not said, one could infer that the only time these men came to notice was when there was a need to blame someone.

d. Some men had a very jaundiced view of the higher CCS staff in Ottawa, and were critical of the limited extent to which they "penetrated" when they visited prisons; "they meet the Director, have dinner, meet the union president, the inmate committee and that's it." "Compare that with when they used to hire a hall for the high brass to come and talk with <u>all</u> the men." There was no change from the perennial complaint that, above the level of the "institution", those at the top are "unreal"; "you never see them

and they just don't know...they've no idea."

e. Even those who claimed to be "happy myself" impressed on us the prevalence of bitterness among guards, especially about an increasing lack of confidence in support from superiors in disciplining prisoners. The persistent picture was of a wish to give the prisoners the benefit of any conflict between them and staff: "in seven out of ten cases you can bet that the guard's charge will be thrown out" and "the word 'no' has ceased to have any meaning." "Officers have given up writing reports on inmates as it's just not worth the hassle." LUOs especially stressed the sense of inferior status that seems to be growing among the guards, and there is plenty of evidence that the latter believe that they have been stripped of whatever authority they had. In a para-military setting emphasising, in symbolic form at least, an hierarchy of authority backed by sanctions, this seems to be a serious contributor to the erosion of confidence and self-respect. The image cited by one subject of a "functionary", whose sole raison d'etre is opening and closing doors and turning keys, becomes quite vivid in the light of comments like this from men who were evidently quite committed to the CCS, and who did not seem to be "bloody-minded".

IN GENERAL

36. The interviews with the men left the impression that correctional work is drifting in a limbo of uncertainty as to what it is meant to achieve. And it is done in a political climate in which there is no interest unless there is trouble of some kind and blame to be placed. Still the work lacks any articulated tradition, and no image is conveyed to the public that seems

to explain what staff at these lower levels do; there is nothing to dismiss the (probably) perceived view of the public that no-one ought to want to do a job like this, or at least to enjoy it. As our last report suggested, this seems to be a pariah occupation as it has been for decades, and nothing that has been done as yet seems to have achieved change. Though the creation of the LUO grades has opened up an avenue of escape from "guarding" on the one hand; on the other, it has emphasised the residual status of the guards themselves and has increased their sense of relative deprivation.

37. After reading and hearing the data in this study it would not be difficult to be lulled into complacency by the obvious truth that our subjects were not too dissatisfied with their lot. As they see their working lives since we interviewed them seven years ago, "things have not gone badly". They and their families are not uncomfortable and they can rely on permanent employment providing they do not give cause for dismissal. And in many respects they are probably a lot better off materially than their predecessors of even a decade ago could have imagined, let alone those of the 1930s.

38. For this improvement in material benefits, no doubt more credit may be due to the USGE (the Union) than most of the men were prepared to give. It is, however, notable that there is still no evidence from this later study of any particular interest by the Union in improving the status of the correctional workers in the basic grades through facilitating further education and more effective training. The men's statements suggest that change in non-material status in the prisons has been most frequent and advantageous to the prisoners while their own has been static, or has even declined. We see this as a rather negative or passive standpoint that need

not persist (and so increase feelings of bitterness and "relative deprivation") if innovative and constructive approaches to improving staff status and self-respect are devised. One wonders why the Union does not press for more extra-mural and intra-mural courses with the latter paid by the employer, for more releases from routine duty (even sabbatical leaves) to take courses or do related work of other kinds. (In the previous work it was suggested that men might be used to inform school students at several levels about the actualities and the possibilities of prison work and life as seen from a different viewpoint than that of the prisoner or of the usually more remote professional worker.) More sophisticated and properly discriminating methods of selection and promotion are also matters to which the Union might give attention if they do not already. The point we make yet again is that status is not only a matter of higher pay, better allowances or reducing hours of work.

39. Another area of potential interest to the Union is the provision of improved supportive services to staff and their families to alleviate the considerable stresses of work in this unique setting. It seems to us that the men and their families need more of these, especially to cope with problems of mental health; some of them can best be met by the skills of the practical "people worker". Others need the special interest of a family doctor who does "house calls" of which Canadian families may get very few indeed nowadays. While the provision of such services may seem an expensive way of providing what is often no more than "a ready ear for troubles", the contribution of this to morale and reducing sick leaves may well exceed the outlay by far. The same may be said of the provision of facilities for keeping fit physically in a milieu in which sedentary

habits of work contradict the extreme physical (and mental) demands of sudden crisis. It would seem that regular rests for physical fitness would not be out of place in such work, and these would compel, ipso facto, the provision of facilities and encourage their use.

40. There is no reason to think that those who are still in uniform and doing security work at the lower levels, i.e. guards, see life differently than they did a decade ago. Then, as our earlier research showed, their self-image--or perhaps more accurately the image of their role--was negative and very vulnerable to persistent denigration from prisoners. It is not part of our task to show what prisoners think of correctional staff so we have to rely on the literature which is copious, though rather dated; it leaves no doubt that there is not much respect, and that attitudes verge on a contempt that has become traditional and, perhaps, mindlessly repetitive.

41. It seems to us to be ridiculous to suppose that prisons--or whatever places of compulsory incarceration are called--will ever be happy places in which to work. But, like all other contexts of employment, they may be more tolerable if there is mutual trust and respect between those who have to live and work in them. And, as the earlier study showed, trust and mutual respect are obtainable only through the investment of personal example and face-to-face leadership which, by definition, cannot be achieved by indirect means. Those who are in charge of custodial staff have to show beyond doubt that <u>they</u> have the qualities to justify their roles, and be able to convey to others their own understanding of the worthwhileness of this unique work. But, as before, we found no evidence of anything like this in the world our subjects described: not even the most elementary

contributor to morale i.e. explanation and encouragement by word-of-mouth. For that we think there are no effective substitutes, whether they be new styles of uniform, more impressive titles, better pay and allowances or new buildings.

43. In saying this we do not under-estimate the immense difficulties of injecting the sort of changes in attitude that might alter the picture reported by our subjects. Objectively one might be encouraged by the evident moves to rectify many of the dysfunctions we found in 1973. Certainly there has been remedial attention given to the serious disjunction between the selection, training and operational elements of the system, and no small amount of credit can be given for the reduction of the then apparent belief among the operational staff that experience is everything, and training courses are inevitably of remote application to the real situation. Such changes in attitude can only be inferred from this research and from the preliminary inquiries that preceded it; there is not enough research evidence, so far as we know, to be sure that things are really as "improved" as they seem. However one has to practice what one preaches and give credit and encouragement to those who are clearly trying hard to surmount daunting difficulties; indeed they are so daunting that only uncomplicated, understandable and relatively simple measures can work... and here we remind the sponsors of our two models--one for a penal system, and the other for a custodial worker--with suitable humility.

This Report has been read by the interviewers and any revisions requested by them or the evaluator have been made.

16 January 1981

SIGNED T. C. Willett

T.C. Willett
Professor of Sociology

## References


Caudill, W., The Psychiatric Hospital as a Small Society, Oxford University Press, 1958.

Colvin, Eric, Prison Officers: A Sociological Portrait of the Uniformed Staff of an English Prison. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis c/o the author, College of Law, University of Saskatchewan.

Evans, Peter, Prison Crisis, Allen and Unwin, London, 1980.

Gerth, H. and Mills, C.W., Character and Social Structure, Harcourt Brace, 1963.

Gottman, E., Asylums, Doubleday, 1961.

Mathiesen, T., The Defence of the Weak, Tavistock, 1964.

_____, Across the Boundaries of Organisations, Glendessary Press, 1971.

May, Hon. Mr. Justice, Committee of Inquiry into the United Kingdom Prison Services: Cmnd 7673, HMSO, London, 1980.

Morris, T.P. and Morris, P., Pentonville, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.

Stanton, A.H. and Schwartz, M.S., The Mental Hospital, 1964.

Stouffer, S.A. et al., The American Soldier, Princeton University Press, 1949.

Willett, T.C., "The Fish Screw", Queen's Law Journal, Vol. 3, No. 3, Summer 1977, pp. 424-449.

APPENDIX A

FINDINGS OF THE 1973 PROJECT

1. The organizational context for the correctional officers' work is excessively complex. The hierarchical power structure is diffuse and confusing, making the by-passing of key roles possible. It is difficult to identify ultimate responsibility, especially in the prison setting; hence a variety of conceptions as to "who is running the show".

2. The historical context of the correctional officers' work is a powerful influence on its "image". Neglect by social historians had led to a highlighting of negative aspects, and it is suggested that the correctional officer is linked with the gaoler and turnkey when his role is conceived. There is little or no evidence of any traditions in the work that might support esprit de corps and morale among staff. There is an ambivalent relationship with the military stemming from historical factors that need further study. Limited analysis suggests that the correctional officer's role is unique.

3. The historical picture shows some confirmation of developments in England in that staff have become more militant and union-oriented as they see their own interests given lower priority than those of prisoners. Prison staff have believed for decades in the principle of "less eligibility": that the lot of the prisoners should always be less eligible than that of the lowest paid honest man; and they deeply resent what they perceive to be a change in this principle.

4. Some of the basic premises of sociological theory about social control are supported empirically, notably the fundamental importance of differences in conceptions of man's basic nature in bringing about cleavages between custodial and treatment personnel, and also the tendency of the majority

among penal workers to reflect the values of the majority of people in the host society. That is, wrongdoing should be punished, and punishment should be felt, though not be cruel; prisons should be "tight ships" and the experience of imprisonment should not be passive or negative. And the position of the prisoner should always be "less eligible" than that of the lowest paid honest worker. Hence the prison cannot be seen as detached from the host value system. Most prison workers do not, therefore, accept as realistic some of the major premises of treatment ideology, which are not consistent with the principle of "less eligibility".

5. The men seemed to have drifted into the work without any clear notion about its nature. Ostensibly it attracted them because of its regular income and stable civil service prospects. They appeared to be normal young Canadian men from the lower middle or working class, who had previously suffered somewhat from the capriciousness of the labour market for semi-skilled and unskilled workers. There was no apparent motivation among them towards work in prisons apart from a certain curiosity about crime and criminals to which the news media appear to have contributed, with consequent distortion.

6. Selection was a rather casual, spontaneous process in which selection board members adopted their own procedures within a loose fitting framework. Basic information on candidates was lacking at the interviews; no references for objective tests of education or intelligence were used as there was a mistaken assumption that they were not allowed. Interviewers were not trained in selection, and the profile reports did not relate with confidential

assessments used while under training nor on subsequent operational service. There was no feed-back to selectors about the effectiveness of their work. Selectors did not work as teams, but tended to come together with little prior warning and often with only hurried consultation about tactics.

7. Pre-selection briefing of candidates was inadequate and sometimes based on incorrect information about the nature of the work. The interviews were out of context since they did not take place in a prison or even at the CSC, thus adding to the risk of misinformation. Though the job requires group work, the qualities for this were not tested in group situations; rotative questioning by a board was confusing to candidates who, mostly, had no previous experience of it. There was no member of personnel staff present as a rule, to answer questions of detail. Delay and confusion occurred between boarding, confirmation and joining for duty because of the practice of screening <u>after</u> boarding rather than beforehand. No tentative recommendations were communicated to candidates who were thus left in uncertainty, often for weeks.

8. The initial impact of the prison was sudden and unstructured. Men were exposed to prisoners without proper preparation and put to duty with them within a week, or sometimes less. Ab initio training was mostly on the job as it would be in any lower-level semi-skilled job; formal training was limited in many cases merely to reading standing orders and directives. The approval of colleagues was earned by hard-line attitudes, and contact with prisoners was actively discouraged. "Spurious militarism" had a disproportionate impact, especially regarding hair styles and dress. The CSC staff and course were under attack from the start; the course was likened to a holiday and recruits were advised to "do as they tell you; then forget

it, as we know best here". "Fish screws" were either accepted, and conditioned to the old guard culture, or rejected and left to themselves. Housing and settling in problems are mentioned as men often arrived at prisons from far away with nowhere to live and no friends.

9. The CSC course was, generally speaking, found to be useful, and the overall ratings at its conclusion were quite good. Motivation and interest appeared to increase while at the College. The course content was thought to be unrealistic in many ways and discrepant with current practice in host-prisons. Treatment of an ambitious syllabus was inevitably superficial given the time available. Overall objectives of staff and students were roughly the same, but priorities differed within and between the two groups. The course did not "stretch" the men intellectually, and the approach of staff was clearly limited by realisation of the actual nature of the work; efforts to offset the latter were suspected by the students as spacious. Rigid and regurgitive tests and examinations were criticised.

10. There seemed to be confusion about the context of "place" of the CSC course in the total induction process. It was not integrated into selection and operational aspects of the work, mainly because of its low credibility in the host prisons whose staff, especially at the lower levels, appeared to sabotage it. The CSC was handicapped by not being associated with a training prison in which its standards could be actualized under control; it was handicapped also by having recruits who had been conditioned against it by those who oppose a less "hard-line" penal philosophy than seems to be typical of the host prisons.

11. The 'guard's' picture of the prison on re-entry showed a depressing environment with marked emphasis on conformity and routine. Objectives were confused and ritualism was rife. Conflict between young and old

correctional staff was marked, and the former especially resented the "military" orientation of some of the older staff. In-service training was minimal, and interest in the job generated at CSC waned fast. There was a noticeable movement from positive to negative in motivation towards the CPS, attitudes to inmates, and attitudes to superior authority, especially about three months after leaving CSC. Superiors showed no interest in the CSC course, and the ex-student was treated as if he had been on a holiday; nothing was done to insert the re-entry phase into the CSC training and men were put onto boring duties at once. Attitudes towards prisoners deteriorated rapidly under pressure from colleagues to adopt the hard-line easy ways of coping, and under persistent pressure from the prisoners, with their marked anti-guard facade. The working day appeared to be a mixture of dull routine and "teacher-schoolboy catch-me-out" or "cops and robbers" game playing. Criticism of superiors for avoiding issues, non-support, and low visibility was marked; directors were rarely seen and higher leadership appeared to be non-existent. Communication between levels of staff, horizontally and vertically, was heavily criticised, especially that between administration and security staff, and between the latter and classification. Internecine conflict between interest groups appeared to be rife. The CX staff appeared confused and alienated by uncertainties about introducing living units and the effects of this in the relative status of security staff. Security work was seen as without challenge or future: a dead end. The picture of the guard was of an alienated "man in between" a series of heavy pressures from superiors, peers, and prisoners against which it was difficult to maintain self-respect. Similarities between the effects of prisonization on guards and inmates

were striking. Habitual use of the term 'guard' or 'screw' was conditioned by the facts of the job.

12. Overtime working was excessive and there were no built-in checks on staleness or fatigue, but the introduction of half-shifts reduced the monotony of double shifts in the same place. Visits of citizen groups to prisons were criticised, owing to loose control and poor understanding of their purpose.

13. Attitudes to wearing uniform were ambivalent. Most men preferred it to distinguish them from prisoners, and to save their own clothes; but they resented its para-military connotations. Uniform was not seen as anything to be proud of, inside or outside the prison, and it would seem that this was due to its symbolic meaning, rather than to its style or its comfort.

14. The "union", The Public Service Alliance, was not apparently of much significance to the men; it was seen as being rather weak, ineffective, and dominated by "Ottawa", or alternatively by the older men. A general state of apathy towards union activities in the prisons was reported. The men saw the CPS as being "small fry" in the large PSA organisation which they did not think was much concerned about their problems. The union was regarded in a very instrumental way; as concerned solely with material benefits. The efforts of some shop stewards were much appreciated in telling men about their rights regarding overtime, warning of changes in shifts and other small but important things. Prison based locals were criticised as being too weak to be influential, and there were suggestions that area or district locals, embracing several prisons, might be better. The impression was that union power is developing quickly, and that time is running out in which to establish good working relationships with

management before excessive militancy prevents this.

15. "Off the job" the men's lives were rather isolated, and affected by the irregular shift-work. Though they did not encounter much overt hostility from the public, they regarded the job as "unpopular" and kept quiet about it. The attitudes of families were generally supportive, but the strain of the work in the authoritarian setting carried over into the home and could disrupt relationships if not controlled carefully. Wives and parents were apprehensive about the dangers of assault and being taken hostage, but this was offset by the appeal of a regular and secure job. Problems were acute when relatives or friends were convicted. Advice to avoid contact with ex-inmates was not taken very seriously, nor was it found to be justified. Heavy drinking was reported, and visits to bars in uniform after coming off duty were mentioned, sometimes with criticism of the behaviour of the older men. The ex-military men kept up all-male drinking practices by using the Royal Canadian Legion, and other service clubs, which appeared to be popular venues. There was little contact reported between families of prison workers, unlike the Morris's experience of England (1963) where there was much socialising between the officers who made frequent use of the officers' clubs.

16. The men had little or no interest in religion or politics, and there was marked ignorance about the latter, despite an impending election. There was no participation in public work of any kind, e.g. youth club work etc. Most men kept fit by hunting, playing hockey, baseball, etc., to break down the antagonisms and alleviate the stresses of the work. We had the impression that official interest in the men finished when they left the job for the day.

17. It seems that the work and the status of a CX 1 or 2 in the CPS was not such as to induce the kind of self-respect that goes with high morale. Indeed their attitudes to themselves were revealed rather significantly by their sometimes quite vehement rejection of the hypothetical suggestion that their sons might follow their footsteps. Apparently they experienced a marked lack of appreciation for what they did, and negative things seemed to dominate the work situation which was not enjoyed. The impression is of a low status worker who is, like the prisoners he guards: taken for granted, and left more or less to himself so long as he does as he is told and gives no trouble - as one man put it quite succinctly, "we're a necessary evil I suppose."

18. In the final chapter the empirical data are related to the theoretical models we divised, grounded mainly on the principle that high morale is founded on a well balanced relationship between personality, social structure and the key role one plays in life. And a further attribute of high morale, so far as the prison worker is concerned, is posited as effective participation in an organisation where selection, training and operational work are integrated to achieve clearly stated and practicable objectives. However, our "worm's eye view" from the subjects of this study suggests that these attributes were not present in the CPS at the time. Objectives were not clear; and there was very little integration of the necessary organisational elements to achieve even the objectives that were cited. There was marked evidence of too easy acceptance of the euphemism as a substitute for real things; of symbols to divert active concern, rather than to inspire and intensify it. And we inferred a sad lack of dynamic personal leadership at nearly all levels, with far too much

reliance on bureaucratic means e.g., directives, memoranda, and other forms of indirect communication. If prison work is essentially work with people, it cannot be done effectively on paper from behind a desk, nor on the telephone; that is one of the more obvious points that might be derived from this study. Another is the need for much more support for the training element, if it is to be an effective means of achieving change towards a constructive penal system. And the final point is to stress the need for more intensive study of key roles and their incumbents in their <u>total social setting</u>, and especially those at the lower levels.

It is stressed that these data and the analysis are derived from a very small group. Further research will be needed to affirm the validity of the findings.

APPENDIX B

CX STUDY 1980 INTERVIEW WITH MEN

FOR GUIDANCE ONLY

GIVE ASSURANCE ABOUT ANONYMITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY OF ANSWERS

1. What is your age now?
2. Have there been any changes in your marital status (explain) since we last saw you?
3. Have you undertaken any further educational courses outside the CCS since we last saw you?
4. Let's talk about your career in the CCS. What changes in rank or in duties (within the rank) have occurred since 1973? (obtain approximate dates of changes).

THE INDUCTION COURSE IN 1973 (Begin recording on tape here)

5. How much has the course we did together at Calderwood helped you in your job?
6. What do you remember specifically of the course that has been of value?
7. In our previous interviews it seemed that there was little respect among most other guards for the induction course or for the instructors at Calderwood. The message was said to be to forget what you learned there, and to treat the course as a holiday. Have reactions to the induction course changed since then?
   PROBE what changes occurred, when, and among which groups, i.e. Administration, keepers and supervisory CX, basic grade CX.
   CHECK explanations for changes, if any.

TRAINING SINCE INDUCTION COURSE

8. What sort of training has been given in your institution since you completed the Induction course?
9. What other in service training have you received?
   CHECK training in handling crisis; fire, escapes etc.
10. What do you think of the training received? Was it worthwhile?
    PROBE for opinions.

WORK IN THE PENITENTIARY

11. What do you think your role in the penitentiary system is?
    CHECK understanding of role and whether S is satisfied with it.
12. What are the ATTRACTIVE aspects of your present job in the CCS?
13. What are the UNATTRACTIVE aspects of it?

CAREER DEVELOPMENT

14. Have the opportunities for advancement in the CCS met your earlier expectations?
    CHECK reasons if answer is NO.
15. What do you think it takes to get ahead as a correctional officer?
    CHECK on influence of membership in R. Cdn. Legion, Freemasons, Armed Forces.
16. How do you see your career developing...your own future in the CCS?
    CHECK whether S intends to stay in CCS or not.
    satisfaction with present career chances.
    PROBE any reasons for dissatisfaction.
17. Many of our friends who did the course with us in 1973 have left the CCS? Why did you stay in?
    CHECK Are you glad you did stay in? (Do you think you did the sensible thing in doing so?)

UNIFORM

18. What does the CCS uniform mean to you?
19. If you wear uniform, does it help or hinder you in your work?
    CHECK whether S would prefer or NOT to wear uniform on the job and why.
20. Do you like the new uniform?
    PROBE for opinions about it.
21. (If applicable, i.e. in uniformed role). Do you wear your uniform in public?
    PROBE how S feels about doing so.

ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES

Let's talk about life in the institution

22. What do you think about the balance of power between Ottawa, Region, the administration, the security staff, the union...and the inmates? Who do you think runs the show?
    CHECK that various elements of power structure are distinguished, and that S understands...emphasise if necessary "who runs the show".

Let's focus especially on the Union

23. What do you think the purpose of the union is?
24. Is it an effective voice for the membership?
    PROBE if answer is NO.
25. Have you been involved in the union personally?
    CHECK if YES in what capacity? If NO why not involved?

26. Do you support fellows who take on union work?
27. Is the union well supported?
28. Has the union helped you personally?
    CHECK if YES. How?

Let's talk about the Living Unit concept

29. How do you think the Living Unit idea is working out? Previously we found very different views; some saw it as the answer to humanising institutions and correctional work; some saw it as merely pampering inmates while leaving their attitudes untouched; others saw it as a means of increasing their own status and rewards. How do you feel about the idea now?
    PROBE for experience of LU work if S is not an LUO now.

A few questions on your private life at home and outside the pen?

30. How does your job affect your life at home?
    PROBE effects on relationship with wife, children, relatives, close neighbours.
31. Are most of your friends in correctional work or in the police?
    PROBE whether being in CCS affects social relationships.
32. Do you have much spare time?
33. How much overtime do you work?
    PROBE for reasons: required, voluntary, financial need etc.
34. What do you do in your spare time?
35. Do you do any other work (than in the CCS) for pay?
    CHECK if YES, what kind and for how long has S done it?
    Does it affect S's CCS work?
36. Is "moonlighting" common among CCS staff?
37. Do you ever consider looking elsewhere for work than in the CCS?
    CHECK If yes, has S applied at any time for another job and what was the result of this? What was response of prospective employers to knowledge that S was in the CCS?
38. Would you encourage your son or your daughter (if you had children) to join the CCS?
    PROBE reasons for answer.

Now a few final points (select according to time available)

39. Does the presence of inmates serving very long sentences make any difference to the dangers of your work?

40. What about homosexuality in prisons? Is it much of a problem? PROBE for views about its incidence and effects on prisoners.

41. ESSENTIAL Before we finish, what changes--major changes--have you noticed in the CCS over the last few years since the last interview?

That's the end of the formal questions. Now is there anything we've not asked about that you would like to tell us?

APPENDIX C

CX STUDY 1980 INTERVIEW WITH SPOUSES etc.

FOR GUIDANCE ONLY

Before beginning to record Introduce yourself and outline the research, especially its aim, and why we are interviewing wives. Give assurances about confidentiality and anonymity.

1. How long have you and your man been living together?
2. Is this your first marriage?
3. Are you new to the CCS or is this your first acquaintance with it?
4. Do you think your man's (use his first name if and when you feel it suitable or easier to do so) work in the CCS has changed him in any way as you see him?

PROBE for details if answer is YES.

5. Does being married to a correctional officer affect your relationship with your parents, relatives, friends, or your neighbours?
6. (if there are children). As far as you know, are your children's relationships with other children affected by your man being a correctional officer?

PROBE for details if YES.

7. How do you feel about going out with your husband when he is wearing his CCS uniform?
8. Would you rather that your man was doing other work (than being a CO) if the income from it was the same as he is now receiving?

PROBE if YES.

9. Have you ever suggested he might find another job outside the CCS?

PROBE if YES.

10. Do you feel that you understand your man's work and its pressures?

PROBE whether children understand it too, and whether there are any subterfuges used to conceal the type of work the man does.

11. Does he bring the job home with him?

PROBE if YES for details.

12. Are most of your friends in corrections or in the police?

PROBE about with whom the family "mixes" socially.

13. Do you have a job outside the home?

PROBE if YES for type of work.

SPOUSE INTERVIEWS (continued)

14. How do you feel about your husband working overtime?
CHECK if necessary to supplement income, especially if subject does not have a job outside her home.
15. Do you ever fear your husband's safety, or that of your family?
PROBE for details if YES.
16. What do you think about the ways in which prisons are run?
PROBE views as to how inmates are, and should be treated.
17. Who does your husband go to when he is up tight about his job?
18. Would you encourage your son or daughter to join the CCS as a correctional officer?
PROBE for reasons if answer is NO.

That completes the formal questions. Is there anything we've not covered that you would like us to know about?